

Hannah Greenhouse
Washington University in St. Louis
November 11, 2017
18:00-20:30

APA Informal Meeting on Agenda Item 3

- Large group powwow pre-meeting

Co-Facilitators

- Unless parties give clear guidance, not possible for them to prepare a draft
 - Grouping/structuring of proposals (clusters)
 - Some parties say if they don't have clusters, they can't join. Other parties say if they do have clusters, they can't join
 - Co-facilitators hands are tied.
 - Parties asked for time to do mind yoga and read the proposal
- Do you have a way forward? Specifically, is there any guidance to the co-facilitators as to how to prepare an informal note that is appropriate to parties

Australia

- 3 parts of note that parties have trouble with
 - Too much content or content not streamlined (losing weight, flesh, etc.)
 - Some parties' views weren't captured in the note
 - Not comfortable with the way clusters were represented
- Proposal to parties...initial ideas, would appreciate comments/suggestions
 - Resistance to clusters 1.2 and 1.3 and 2.2 and 2.3
 - Replace those clusters with party inputs that have been provided
 - Those inputs are seen in full and attributed to parties
 - 1.1 and 2.1 (substantive information for information and accounting from parties seen in the non-paper)
 - Suggest that they are placed in the main body of the preliminary note
 - Substantive elements 1.1
 - Specific elements 2.1
 - Disagreement over how much of the cluster should be placed in the main paper
 - Accounting comfort had different levels of comfort compared to information comfort
 - Take cluster 2.2 and ask secretariat to streamline – retain unique customs and not remove any meaning information, but simply words and remove duplication
 - For non-substantive elements throughout the whole note, streamline duplications so that the document is more readable
 - Points of contention
 - How much of cluster 1.1/2.1 should be retained in this indicated format?
 - How parties' inputs are added to this particular note
 - Parties/groups input in alphabetical order and clearly attributed under substantive elements
 - Parties views captured in full

- Changes based on other suggestions
 - Information elements sit right after information section (same as accounting)
 - Inserted a simple table of comments
- Questions?

Marshall Islands (AOSIS)

- Everything until page 10 has basically stayed as it was under the initial grouping
- Under features where we have current list – is that just a title or is it also a structure?

Australia

- Everything that we saw in the preliminary note in the first half is retained in full and streamlined
- Only things changed in the appendix of clusters is that 1.1 and 2.1 have been moved and that parties' input have been added in full

China (LMDC)

- Work to streamline/shorten points from page 1-10, but at the same time keep the key concepts on the paper
- Put parties input into a bullet point item after substantial elements and put specific elements after accounting
- After that, there's still work by co-facilitators to still list parties' views after specific elements of accounting
- Whether or not this approach can fly, we should set some deadline for our work for parties and co-facilitators and then gather next week and see if it works
- Fundamental issues
 - Do we need attribution to the specific group/party that provides input to co-facilitators?
 - Example: Input by group/party Australia, inputs by group/party LMDC
 - OR 3rd option: inputs by group/party banana, inputs by group/party apples
 - So we all have a nickname
 - We don't think we can accept attribution, we can all find equal footing in this text and next year in Bonn we can discuss bones and flesh in a constructive manner
 - This is still all flesh
 - Having your name there can make you feel awkward, so instead have a nickname
 - Concern over clusters
 - This is just 1 parties input, it shouldn't prejudge in that direction
 - Where should this be?
 - We can't accept any appendixes
 - We need to figure out placement
- Question over shortened version over cluster 1.1 and 2.1
 - If we replicate a short version of these clusters, the next time we're going to have a procedural debate
 - Propose to drop cluster 1.1 and 2.1 right now
 - Would protect all countries and help them find equal footing next year

Co-facilitators

- We've talked about flesh and bones so much; we could have cats or birds or other animals to attribute these submissions too
- So you're not in favor of having a shortened version of 1.1 and 2.1 in version of text?

China:

- Correct

PNG

- Procedural concern
- Support Marshall Islands
- Looking at this product on the board is uncomfortable
- The document currently before us is the informal note that includes all parties' submissions
- Co-facilitators set up a room yesterday and plenty of people were willing to work with us
 - But no one did
- We had all day to have received this proposal but we didn't
- Completely uncomfortable with Australia's proposal
 - Just one country—didn't come from a round table or anything
- Procedurally useful if we could just close this proposal from the board and just have a general discussion on how we want to proceed

Russia

- Australia's proposal is constructive and in line with PA
- We're prepared to engage further on this proposal and believe we could accommodate views/concerns of all parties over this proposal

Switzerland

- Question to China: 1.1 and 2.1 would more or less disappear and replaced by all submissions? What would you, China, expect as being the first issue discussed in Bonn?
 - Need a clear, common understanding of what we're going to do in Bonn in May
- Also didn't fully understand proposal

Saudi Arabia

- Welcome the opportunity to engage on Australia's proposal
 - Gives us a clear idea on how move forward and how to give mandate to co-facilitators
- In the original proposal, 1.1 and 2.1 remain as appendixes. Will the parties'/groups' inputs be captured as an appendix or in the main document?
- Share view with China re: 1.1 and 2.1
 - Submissions address specific issues based on discussions, these submissions have been captured in some ways in 1.1 and 2.1
 - Have identified mistakes in 1.1 and 2.1
 - Mistakes in capturing language/ideas
 - Believe this is the best way to capture divergence of options (especially for information and accounting sections)
- What will we do in May?
 - Engage on options/views in a clear, concise manner
 - If after this, we don't know where to continue, we can proceed in a formal manner

Co-Facilitators

- Options
 - Shorten version into main text under info/accounting
 - Delete these clusters in their entirety and not take a shorten version into the text
- Groups not happy about engaging with this document because they're seeing it for the first time, I would appeal for you to make an effort
 - Very short and it is reflecting material from the tool from yesterday
 - But not trying to pressure you into taking this
 - But we are supposed to finish by Tuesday afternoon
 - But, it will be rainy tomorrow so if we have to work it's not the end of the world

India

- We're finding greater convergence
- Trying to bring us to a point where it's feasible to finish
- Agree with China
 - Future of cluster 1.1 and 2.1
 - Moving towards a document that would capture parties' views in terms of the clusters
 - Both of these clusters are a sort of synthesis
 - Don't belong to any party
 - Issue with how cluster was structured and balance of parties' views
 - Move on towards a document that would reflect the view of all parties
 - Should views of parties be in main document or appendix?
 - We vote for main document
 - Appendix means something that's extraneous and not part of the main document
 - Meaning in May we don't have to bother with excluding appendixes

Brazil

- We're ready to engage with Australia's proposal
- Can we engage if not all parties are happy?
 - Not a constructive way to work
- Key to have clear understanding of who and how would shorten/streamline clusters
- Our delegations couldn't move from this with just a copy-paste of 1.1 and 2.1
- Headings aren't best way to structure paper
- Should we delete clusters entirely or shortened them?
 - Vote for shortened version
 - Flexible as to if they're included in the body of the formal note or as an annex
- Re: Retribution
 - We don't care
- Would be comfortable given this proposal giving co-facilitators mandate to streamline and cut proposal from 1-11, but our groups option isn't reflected in the features section
- How do we get to the shortened version to structure discussions?
- Accounting: similar issue
 - Understand what's in 2.1 has everyone's views, but there's headings that there should be no discussion in this agenda item
 - Not our business to negotiate

- China proposed some parallel work
 - We could engage in that

Co-Facilitators

- Who would do the streamlining?
 - If you mandate us to with the secretariat, we will do so. If there isn't agreement that streamlining should be done or that we shouldn't do it, then it's up to parties

China (LMDC)

- Re: Switzerland
 - Not focused on outcome of this session
 - Point of this session is to find proper way to reflect parties' views in a balanced manner
 - Not to think about something happening in 6 months
 - Why we want to drop 1.1 and 2.1, is we don't want any procedure debate over what part of the text we need to engage with
- Use the "Triple D" approach:
 - Digest this task in the following half a year and guess what each nickname stands for
 - Discuss something based on this solid material
 - "This crossed our red line" "why?" → discuss these claims
 - Develop some kind of bridging proposals

Marshall Islands (AOSIS)

- If we do go through this route where we lose the clusters, this group would submit relevant appendixes (accounting and information) from non-paper in their entirety as our submissions
- Streamlining – who and how would do this?
 - If there isn't any shortening/streamlining, then what benefit does this approach has compared to your informal note?
 - Only that parties potentially get more attribution
 - But ours will just be from the non-paper
- Concerns about streamlining
 - Changes the status of what's there
 - Extremely important to know who will be doing it
- Don't have mandate from group to do anything besides very light streamlining or consolidation of 1.1 and 2.1 (removing redundancies)
 - Not ok with bullet points
 - Would like light streamlining/consolidation mandate but nothing else

Ethiopia

- We can work on not having annexes and having 1.1 and 2.1 as references
- Have things missing in co-facilitators' note
 - Want those to be in main text
- Don't know how you'd streamline 1.1 and 2.1?
- Can we send co-facilitators what's missing in their iteration?
- But, don't want our submissions as annexes
- 1.1 is already view of parties
 - So some parties already have views there
 - Should include all additional parties' views there as well

- Priorities:
 - Give co-facilitators what's missing and they can include it in 1.1 or 2.1 (other parties should do this too)
 - Don't know why we need to say whose submission is whose
 - From discussions we already know

Zimbabwe (African Group)

- Keep 1.1 and 2.1
- Parties views can also propose adage to the proposal
 - Used by co-facilitators to include all parties' views in new document
 - Parties views should be clearly reflected and we reserve the right to make additional changes in future iterations

European Union

- Yesterday, asked to study preliminary note
- Australia's suggestion appears to keep one of the key features
 - Reflecting all substantial inputs by parties
- Attribution of attachments is necessary so parties know that their views are expressed
 - If parties don't want this, parties can submit as anonymous
- What to do with 1.1 and 2.1?
 - Some want it in its entirety, some want it streamlined, others only light streamlining
 - Should ensure all views are there
 - We don't think streamlining is necessary, but willing to allow co-facilitators to delete redundancies if necessary
- Believe that 1.1 and 2.2 do capture all parties' views

Colombia

- Parties should be free to bring up any issues they feel need to be included
- Haven't discussed a lot about procedure/structure
- Chile mentioned having a 3rd option about features that we agree with
- We will engage today and tomorrow and then ask co-facilitators to work on streamlining the document that we will have by Monday
 - Hope co-facilitators will find convergence and divergence and duplications are deleted
- Believe that to provide parties insurance, when we go into views of parties it should be clear that these are the parties' views
 - Should be a document of the parties

Iran

- From the original informal note, there were many difficulties.
- The preliminary material included many elements and we think it could be a good basis of discussion
 - But with discussion yesterday, no basis to move forward with discussions
- Proposal from Australia might be a way to continue
- Can count on co-facilitators to capture ideas from clusters and first part of preliminary material
 - Any party/group should have right to go back and add to the text and improve on the text prior to the May session

USA

- Australia's proposal is a workable way forward
- Having a round of submissions to co-facilitators in the next day seems reasonable to us
 - co-facilitators have heard from parties and we trust them forward
- Are some fixes needed in original note from yesterday and Australia's plan
- Hope we have ideas in a workable form that we can all look at together

Mexico

- Need proposals for us to move forward so let's discuss them
- Some people said we didn't have time to discuss proposal yesterday, but now that I've reflected and discussed we think this tool can be useful
- Happy to engage with Australia's proposal

Switzerland

- Could work with Australia's proposal if there's some fundamental changes, but without those maybe we couldn't
- 4 points
 - Need to be able to comment on the points that are black on the screen
 - Might not reflect all Parties' views
 - Attribution to countries?
 - Need to know who makes submissions
 - Can't move from this position
 - When a party makes a submission they should be willing to stand by that proposal
 - Why delete 1.1 and 2.1?
 - What happens if 20 countries submit nearly the same submission with small changes?
 - Won't have something digestible
 - Moving towards something worse than the Geneva Text
 - Wouldn't be a good use of our time
- We came to Bonn to work on substance
 - Will have spent 2 weeks without looking at substance
 - Need to leave with a clear understanding that next time we discuss substance
 - Not talking about bridging 100s of very similar proposals that lead to 2 options for structure

Co-Facilitators

- Not discussing substance isn't unique to this room
 - Should probably be taken up in contact group with the co-chairs

India

- Usability of cluster 1.1 and 2.1 and using it as basis of future work
 - We have serious reservations about those clusters
 - Don't feel comfortable with the structure or balance that it tries to achieve
- Support dropping clusters 1.1 and 2.1

China (LMDC)

- Once upon a time we showed flexibility
 - Now more pressure on us
 - Maybe life isn't easy for us
- In past sessions, we've repeated our red lines, super red lines, super-super red lines
- Want to drop 1.1 and 2.1, but willing to engage with parties to see their ideas
 - Can't accept these clusters though
- But will be flexible re: Australia's proposal
- Need to end session with a document
- Willing to compromise to find bridging approach
 - Willing to drop clusters
- Serious worry with clusters 1.1 and 2.1
- We aren't fully satisfied, but can work on this proposal
- Necessary for us to enter into substantial negotiations
 - We're the swiftest of any other group
- Why we propose dropping these clusters is to stop procedural debates over whether we have to engage with these clusters
 - Quite reluctant to engage with these clusters (1.1 and 2.1)
- Can't agree to leaving these clusters, so better to drop them because of no consensus

Co-Facilitators

- If there is an informal note coming from this meeting, it won't be an agreed paper or anything accepted by parties
 - Just something parties think they'll be able to work with in the future
- Co-Facilitators are at your disposal
 - But no consensus about what they should do
- If we're the most advanced group in this process, it'd be a shame to not have anything on paper

Australia

- Sorry for leaving, I had to go to the toilet
- Re: Attribution
 - Some parties would like it, some wouldn't, some would like groups
 - Suggestion: If parties give suggestions to co-facilitators, could indicate if they would like it to be attributed they can say that if not they can say that
- Not all, but some willingness to provide co-facilitators the change to reiterate their note based on input from parties
- Treatment of 1.1
 - Shorten, don't shorten...
 - Suggestion: co-facilitators have heard views of parties; could we entrust navigating this process to you? And taking into account what you've heard today

Saudi Arabia (Arab League)

- Question of attribution
 - We don't understand need for attributions
 - Would communicate a negative message that we've only collected parties' views into one paper

- We should move ahead and see different positions merging into each other if they're separated by attribution
- Nicknames?
 - Saudi Arabia would like to be the camel
- Attribution isn't constructive
 - Shouldn't be there
- Ex. Arab Group may find modalities with other group and they could merge
 - If we lose attribution, would contribute a message of unification
- Attribution of text isn't constructive
- Should parties get to choose if they're parties are attributed?
 - We will be able to identify it ourselves
- If countries want to be attributed, that's not a major concern
- Don't want to have a submissions portal where you can see all submissions
- Cluster 4 = Arab Group
 - Different approach from the other 3 groups
 - Goal to take constructive step forward

China (LMDC)

- In order to show maximum compromise and give everyone an A+, propose middle ground
- I hope my ministers won't kill me when I go back to my capital
 - Attribution
 - Can borrow approach from Australia (opt in and opt out)
 - Understand concern from Saudi Arabia
 - Appeal to colleagues to be an anonymous angel and not a bully with a nickname or actual name
 - Do we need clusters 1.1 and 2.1?
 - Shortened or streamlined version
 - Some don't want this
 - Could consider entrusting co-facilitators with shortening this and making it as concise and smart as possible
- To help co-facilitators can give concrete suggestions
 - In non-paper, page 14-17 (specific elements), those could be a good example for your consideration when you do this streamlining exercise
 - Leave no one behind
 - Keep in mind red lines and super red lines
 - I'll make a suicide step to help co-facilitators but don't want turbulence or to say anything super undiplomatic
 - I trust co-facilitators from today until the last day...and my watch starts now

Co-Facilitators

- Would like to indicate some steps and then you tell me if you support taking those steps or not
 - All parties are invited to submit proposals on information and accounting and within their discretion to indicate if they want to be named or not
 - With the help of secretariat, we will streamline appendixes 1.1 and 2.1 in terms of guidance
 - We will go over the text again and see if we can streamline further

- If a party thinks anything is missing from the text or from the form of clusters 1.1 and 2.1. please send us your additions
- On Monday, co-facilitators come back to you with a proposal that will have no status
 - Asked by co-chairs to produce 1st iteration of informal note
 - But can ask co-facilitator if they can show it to parties prior to calling it an informal note
- Question of a deadline for input (only copy-pasting)
 - Propose tomorrow (Nov. 12) at 5pm
- Will take parties' input if they would like to send it and try to put out informal-nothing on the website by tomorrow at 6pm
 - Also, integrate missing things
 - But please send those before tomorrow at 5pm
 - ASAP please
- Can parties go along with this?
 - Stress that this is just an exercise and on Monday parties can say if this is acceptable to them
 - We can hopefully discuss this again on Monday

Saudi Arabia

- Clarification: Party submissions on accounting and information due at 5pm
 - Propose 2 deadlines:
 - 11am or 12pm to give comments/suggestions/mistakes in the clusters
 - Give co-facilitators time to work on 1.1 and 2.1
- Suggestion: Attribution: Take note of all of the parties that opt in for the attribution to be made on the floor
 - Then, if parties want input attributed they can say that on Monday
- Questions: What will be the organization of the paper? What will a streamlined 1.1 and 2.1 look like on the final paper?

Co-Facilitators

- Where would streamlined clusters be placed?
 - Can't give definite answer now
 - Likely near end of the note near the section on substance
- Re: Attributions
 - We are quite relaxed about that. If proposal by Saudi is ok, we're happy to go along with that

Marshall Islands

- We're ok with co-facilitators proposal
 - Sure you noted previous comments made
- Re: Saudi Arabia proposal
 - Understand your deadline suggestion, but we need till 5pm
 - For comments we're submitting entire appendixes, but need more time for other comments

Co-Facilitators

- You have till 5pm

Switzerland

- We want our submission to have our name on it from the beginning
- If Saudi Arabia doesn't want names, someone from his staff can go through and delete all of the name
- If having names isn't an option, then we will put Switzerland into the comment itself

Saudi Arabia (Arab League)

- I expected that
- Having 1 party attributed will encourage Arab Group to have their name attributed and this will put us in a very difficult position, but we hope that we can work with that

China

- If parties want reference, there should be a footnote to identify attribution
 - Would make text clean

Co-Facilitators

- Can all parties agree with this procedure?
- Yes? Okay, meeting adjourned